UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/818,688	03/26/2001	Youfeng Wu	042390.P10788	9953

7590 09/23/2004

Sanjeet K. Dutta
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER	
VO, TED T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2122	

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/818,688	WU, YOUFENG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ted T. Vo	2122	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 July 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,10-17 and 19-26* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *9,18 and 27* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5/14/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the Amendment in the Applicants' filing, Request for Continuation, on 7/13/04, where Claims 1, 10, and 19 are amended.

Claim 1 which is rejected under 35 USC 101 is withdrawn based on the amendment.

Claims 9, 18, and 27 stand objected as being addressed in Allowable Subject Matter.

Claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-26 have been fully considered by the Examiner, and stand rejected as being addressed below.

Claims 1-27 remain pending in the application.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's argument to the rejection under 35 USC 101 to the amended claim 1 is considered.

With regard to this amendment, Claim 1 previously rejected under this statute is withdrawn.

- Applicant's arguments to Claims 1 and 19, which are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Duesterwald et al., have been fully considered.

Especially, regarding limitation, *performing repeatedly edge profiling on a program using hardware and software, including directly measuring branch execution frequencies over an entire execution period of the program:*

- Applicants argue Duesterwald does not disclose using hardware and software by asserting that Duesterwald is software approach to perform path profiling (remarks: page 10, line 15).

Examiner disagrees: At page 202, right column, last paragraph Duesterwald makes known (discloses) that the hardware counters (*hardware*) is known as used in profiling. At section 4, page 205, Duesterwald makes known Online Prediction Schemes (*hardware and software*) is used in profiling.

- Applicants argue Duesterwald does not disclose *directly measuring branch execution frequencies over an entire execution period of the program* by asserting that Duesterwald describes for hot path prediction.

Examiner disagrees: Counter has means of *directly measuring branch execution frequencies*. At page 202, line19: prediction of hot paths (or hot branches, hot edges, hot calls). Figure 1 shows a direct measurement of branches; pages 203-204 section 2 Computing Path Profiles discloses means for directing measuring. Giving the statement "most frequently executing paths based on a limited amount of execution history", it does not mean that Duesterwald execution does not has means of *an entire execution period of the programs* (See page 210, section 6,1, "hot paths are predicted for entire run of the program".

-Applicants' arguments to Claims 1 and 19, which are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Conte, have been fully considered.

Especially, regarding limitation, *detecting phase transition repeatedly* (remarks: pages 11-12, in '25 USC 102(b)), applicants argues Conte's Figure 4 describing transitions between blocks along the execution path, not phase transition, and Applicant simply argues that Conte does not disclose this feature taught by Claim 1 (remarks: page 12, lines 6-12).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. While maintaining the broad scope of the claim using limitation *phase transition,* the limitation *phase transition* (or *detecting phase transition repeatedly*) would not be limited away from Conte's teaching - detection of block transitions in profiling at branches. Particularly, page 14, left column, line 23-45, Conte discusses a detection of a transition by using the extra code inserted in transition basis block to record the execution along the arc (edge profiling). Figure 4, has the means of showing the transition phase by recording arc/node weights of the graph. Actual/Estimate mentioned in the detection is only another aspect of the Conte's disclosure. The passage page 14, left column, line 23-45 meets the limitation: *detecting phase transition repeatedly*.

- Applicant's arguments to Claim 1-8, 10-17, and 19-26, which are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Wu in view of Conte, have been fully considered.

Especially, in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Wu does not address *phase transitions.* However, Wu's disclosing of *block profiling, find frequency execution of basic insert counters at branch instructions* is a basic technique used common and known in any profiling. Conte's disclosing, *detecting profile phase transitions repeatedly,* by discussing detection of a transition by using graph weights and using the extra code inserted in transition basis block to record the execution along the arc, is extension of such a basic technique. Conte does not need to discuss things/terminologies that are clearly known in profiling. Therefore, at the time of the invention, such basis elements such as *block profiling, find frequency execution of basic insert counters at branch instructions* are the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. With the combination, it would extend the basic profiling technique to guide the detection of hotspots more accurate and effective.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Duesterwald et al., "Software Profiling for Hot Path Prediction: Less is More", ACM 2000.

Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of followed claims in light of the specification:

As per claim 1:

Duesterwald discloses, "*A method, comprising:*

performing repeatedly edge profiling on a program using hardware and software, including directly measuring branch execution frequencies over an entire execution period of the program (Page 202, right column, last paragraph, hardware counters (hardware). Page 205, section 4, Online Prediction Schemes (hardware and software));

detecting profile phase transitions repeatedly (Re: Duesterwald: See page 204, whole section 3. Hot Path prediction; and also see page 210, left column, section 6.1, second paragraph, started with 'Phase changes are implicitly recognized by path prediction scheme...'); *and*

optimizing the program based upon the profile phase transitions and edge profile (Re: Duesterwald: See page 202, section 1, Introduction, particularly, right column, first paragraph, discussing about dynamic compilation systems and dynamic optimizers).

As per Claim 19: Claim 19 recites a computer-readable medium that has the claim limitation corresponding to the functionality of Claim 1. Claim 19 is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of Claim 1 above.

5. Claims 1 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Conte et al., "Using Branch Handling Hardware to Support Profile-Driven Optimization", ACM, 1994.

As per Claim 1:

Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of followed claims in light of the specification:

Conte discloses, *"A method, comprising:*

performing repeatedly edge profiling on a program using hardware and software, including directly measuring branch execution frequencies over an entire execution period of the program (Page

14, left column, line 23-45, a detection of a transition by using the extra code inserted in transition basis block to record the execution along the arc (edge profiling));

detecting profile phase transitions repeatedly (Re: Conte: Page 16, right column, section 3.4 – second paragraph: started with "The metric..."; and Figure 4)*; and*

optimizing the program based upon the profile phase transitions and edge profile (Re: Conte: Page 12, section 1).

As per Claim 19: Claim 19 recites a computer-readable medium that has the claim limitation corresponding to the functionality of Claim 1. Claim 19 is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of Claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 1-8, 10-17, and 19-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Wu et al., "An Efficient Software-Hardware Collaborative Profiling Technique for Wide-Issue Processors", 1999, in view of Conte et al., "Using Branch Handling Hardware to Support Profile-Driven Optimization".

Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of followed claim in light of the specification:

As per Claim 1:

Wu discloses a method for performing repeatedly edge profiling on a program and detecting profile information given at a branch instruction in a program. The detection is done by insetting memory

counters at (See page 1, last two paragraphs, and see Figure 1, page 2). The teaching covers the limitation hereafter:

"performing repeatedly edge profiling on a program using hardware and software, including directly measuring branch execution frequencies over an entire execution period of the program (Re: Wu: See Figure 1, page 2).

detecting profile phase transitions repeatedly; and

optimizing the program (Re: Wu: See page 1, first paragraph of section 1 Introduction, 'runtime profiling and optimization') *based upon the profile phase transitions and edge profile".*

Wu does not particularly address *phase transitions,* but mentions about *block profiling, find frequency execution of basic insert counters at branch instructions* (Re: Wu: See page 1, last two paragraphs).

Conte discloses *detecting profile phase transitions repeatedly* by adding transition block targeted at each branch and using arc weights (Re: Conte: Page 14, left column, line 23-45, a detection of a transition by using the extra code inserted in transition basis block to record the execution along the arc (edge profiling); and see page 16, right column, section 3.4 – second paragraph: started with "The metric..."; and Figure 4). For example, Conte calculates the occurring transition at block 7 and block 8 (Re: Conte: page 16, right column, section 3.4 – second paragraph – lines 8-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Wu, *"profile information" detected from branch instructions*, and the teaching of Conte, "*Calculating the transition change*". Doing so would extend the basic profiling technique to guide the detection of hotspots more accurate and effective.

As per claim 2:

With regards to the limitation of Claim 2, Wu further discloses using software to insert profile instruction and arrange profile data (Re Wu: See page 6, second paragraph, '...to each of the branch blocks...'), executing that program, and particularly, Wu uses hardware to update the 'profiled information' detected at branch instructions (Re: Wu: See page 6, section 4.2, Profiling hardware, 'At runtime...').

Wu does not particularly address *update profile phase transitions, and signal phase transitions,* but uses the hardware to update profiling information (Re: Wu: See page 6, section 4.2, Profiling hardware, 'At runtime...').

Conte discloses *using hardware* (Re: Conte: Page 17, Figure 4 (b)) *to update profile phase transitions, and signal phase transitions* (Re: Conte: page 16, right column, Table 2, and section 3.4 – second paragraph – lines 8-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include hardware to update '*phase transition*' and '*signal phase transitions'* as disclosed by Conte into the combination of Wu, "profile information" detected from branch instructions, and of Conte, "Calculating the transition change". Doing so would have the support of hardware, and thus would reduce profiling overhead and detect hotspots more accurate and effective.

As per claim 3: Wu further discloses, "*The method of claim 2, wherein using software to insert profiling instructions comprises modifying branch instructions to assign an identifier to one or more profiled edges, and to assign a value to an edge selection field*" (Re: Wu: See page 6, section 4.1.3).

As per claim 4: Wu discloses, "*The method of claim 3, wherein using software to insert profiling instructions further comprises inserting a profile identifier instruction when the profiled edge lacks at least one of a branch instruction;* (see page 6, second paragraph, '...to each of non branch blocks...',) *an initialize profile instruction; and a set offset instruction*" (Re: Wu: See page 4, section 3, Profiling instruction and Registers).

As per claim 5: Wu further discloses, "*The method of claim 2, wherein using hardware comprises translating edge profiling instructions into profile update operations*" (Re: Wu: See page 6, last paragraph, 'three update operations').

As per claim 6: Wu further discloses, "*The method of claim 4, further comprising: loading a profile information register with a base address, an offset value, a trigger-counter, and a flag*" (Re: Wu: See page 7, Figure 3).

As per claim 7: Wu further discloses, "*The method of claim 5, further comprising: intercepting with hardware the profiling instructions; generating a profile update operation; and updating profile counters*" (Re: Wu: See page 2, second bullet, 'update operation to manipulate profile operation').

As per claim 8:

Regarding the limitation of Claim 8, Wu discloses detecting profile information given at a branch instruction in a program. Wu discloses the detection of occurred profile information using a special status register, "profile information register" (Re: Wu: See page 4, section 3), which is dedicated for profiling. Wu does not disclose, "*profile phase transitions*" and *generating an interrupt signal by the hardware when the profile phase transition occurs*".

Conte discloses the transition changes of profiling that uses a counter to update a branch target in a program (Re: Conte: page 16, section 3,4, and page 17, Figure 4). Conte discloses *generating a phase transition interrupt signal* (based on Conte's Figure 4) in discussing handling errors due to the transition difference of the edges (Re: Conte: page 18, section 4.1; particularly see 'Exceptions' in first paragraph of right column), and optimizing based upon transitions and edge profile (Re: Conte: page 12, section 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings *detection of profile information using a special status register, "profile information register"* of Wu and *detecting profile changes at the edges and exception handling caused by the transition changes* of Conte. Doing so would take the advantage of hardware supports, and thus would reduce profiling overhead and detect hotspots more accurate and effective.

As per Claim 10:

Wu discloses a system for performing repeatedly edge profiling on a program and detecting profile information given at a branch instruction in a program. The detection is done by insetting memory counters at (See page 1, last two paragraphs, and see Figure 1, page 2). The teaching covers the limitation hereafter:

"*A system, comprising:*

a processor pipeline to generate a profile ID for each profiled edge, and generate profile update operations (Re: Wu: See page 1, last three lines; see page 7, Figure 3)*;*

a profile information register coupled to the processor pipeline (Re: Wu: See page 4, referring to the data structure, 'branch_id ID')*;*

a first logic device to accept the profile update operations and profile ID to generate a memory buffer address (Re: Wu: See page 7, Figure 3)*;*

a profile cache to accept the buffer address connected to the first logic device (Re: Wu: See page 8, Figure 5, 'profile cache')*; and*

Wu does not disclose, *a second logic device coupled to the profile cache configured to generate a phase transition interrupt signal, wherein the system performs edge profiling on a program, detects profile phase transitions repeatedly, and optimizes the program based upon the profile phase transitions*". Wu instead discloses logic devices coupled to the profile cache (Re: Wu: Figure 5, 'Profile operation') configured to generate profiling information signal and to detect profile information repeatedly (Re: Wu: Figure 5, ID → addr → 'Profile operation'). The Wu's system performs edge profiling on a program and optimizes the program based upon the profile information (Re: Wu: page 1, section 1: Introduction, first paragraph, 'runtime profiling and optimization').

Conte discloses the transition changes of profiling. Conte uses a counter to update a branch target in a program (Re: Conte: page 16, section 3,4, and page 17, Figure 4). Conte discloses *generating a phase transition interrupt signal* (based on Figure 4) in discussing handling errors due to transition difference of the edges (Re: Conte: page 18, section 4.1; particularly see 'Exceptions' in first paragraph of right column), and optimizing programs based upon transitions and edge profile (Re: Conte: page 12, section 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings *using profile operation that coupled with profile cache* of Wu and *detecting profile changes at the edges and exception handling caused by the transition changes* of Conte. Doing so would take the advantage of hardware supports, and thus would reduce profiling overhead and detect hotspots more accurate and effective.

As per claim 11:

With regards to the limitation of Claim 11, Wu further discloses a processor pipeline that executes a program (Re: Wu, page 8, Figure 5), intercepts profiling instructions, and updates profile counters (Re: Wu: Page 4, section 3, "Profiling instructions and registers", and page 8, Figure 5).

Wu does not particularly address *profile phase transitions trigger counters, and signal phase transitions,* but instead, uses special counters for profiling to update profiling information (Re: Wu: Page 4, section 3, "Profiling instructions and registers").

Conte discloses *profile phase transitions, and signal phase transitions* (Re: Conte: Page 16, right column, Table 2, and section 3.4 – second paragraph – lines 8-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to take advantage of special counters of Wu for updating '*phase transition*' and '*signal phase transitions'* as disclosed by Conte into the combining teachings of Wu, "profile information" detected from branch instructions, and of Conte, "Calculating the transition change". Doing so would have the support of hardware counters, and thus would reduce profiling overhead and detect hotspots more accurate and effective.

As per Claim 12: Wu further discloses, "*The system of claim 11, wherein the software inserts edge profiling instructions for modifying branch instructions to assign an identifier to one or more profiled edges, and to assign a value to an edge selection field*" (Re: Wu: See page 6, section 4.1.3).

As per Claim 13: Wu further discloses "*The system of claim 12, wherein the software while inserting edge profiling instructions, also inserts a profile identifier instruction when the profiled edge does not have a branch instruction* (Re: Wu: See page 6, second paragraph, '...to each of non branch blocks...',); *an initialize profile instruction; and a set offset instruction*" (Re: Wu: See page 4, section 3, Profiling instruction and Registers).

As per Claim 14: Wu further discloses, "*The system of claim 11, wherein the processor translates edge profiling instructions into profile update operations*" (Re: Wu: See page 6, last paragraph, 'three update operations').

As per Claim 15: Wu further discloses, "*The system of claim 13, wherein the processor pipeline loads a profile information register with a base address, an offset value, a trigger-counter, and a flag.*" (Re: Wu: See page 7, Figure 3).

As per Claim 16: Wu further discloses, "*The system of claim 14, wherein the processor pipeline: intercepts the profiling instructions; generates a profile update operation; and updates profile counters.*" (Re: Wu: See page 2, second bullet, 'update operation to manipulate profile operation').

As per Claim 17: Regarding the limitation of Claim 17, Wu discloses detecting profile information given at a branch instruction in a program. Wu discloses the detection of occurred profile information using a special status register, "profile information register" (Re: Wu: See page 4, section 3), which is dedicated for profiling.

Wu does not disclose, "*profile phase transitions*" and "*generating an interrupt signal by the hardware when the profile phase transition occurs*".

Conte discloses the transition changes of profiling that uses a counter to update a branch target in a program (Re: Conte: Page 14, left column, line 23-45, a detection of a transition by using the extra code inserted in transition basis block to record the execution along the arc (edge profiling). Page 16, section 3,4, and page 17, Figure 4). Conte discloses *generating a phase transition interrupt signal* (based on Conte's Figure 4) in discussing handling errors due to the transition difference of the edges (Re: Conte: page 18, section 4.1; particularly see 'Exceptions' in first paragraph of right column), and optimizing based upon transitions and edge profile (Re: Conte: page 12, section 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings *detection of occurred profile information using a special status register, "profile information register"* of Wu and *detecting profile changes at the edges and exception handling caused by the transition changes* of Conte. Doing so would take the advantage of hardware supports, and thus would reduce profiling overhead and detect hotspots more accurate and effective.

As per Claim 19: Claim 19 recites a computer-readable medium that has the claim limitation corresponding to the functionality of Claim 1. Claim 19 is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of Claim 1.

As per Claim 20: Claim 20 recites a computer-readable medium that has the claim limitation corresponding to the functionality of Claim 2. Claim 20 is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of Claim 2.

As per Claim 21: Claim 21 recites a computer-readable medium that has the claim limitation corresponding to the functionality of Claim 3. Claim 21 is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of Claim 3.

As per Claim 22: Claim 22 recites a computer-readable medium that has the claim limitation corresponding to the functionality of Claim 4. Claim 22 is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of Claim 4.

As per Claim 23: Claim 23 recites a computer-readable medium that has the claim limitation corresponding to the functionality of Claim 5. Claim 23 is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of Claim 5.

As per Claim 24: Claim 24 recites a computer-readable medium that has the claim limitation corresponding to the functionality of Claim 6. Claim 24 is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of Claim 6.

As per Claim 25: Claim 25 recites a computer-readable medium that has the claim limitation corresponding to the functionality of Claim 7. Claim 25 is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of Claim 7.

As per Claim 26: Claim 26 recites a computer-readable medium that has the claim limitation corresponding to the functionality of Claim 8. Claim 26 is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of Claim 8.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 9, 18, and 27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and filing terminal disclaimer.

Regarding limitation: "*further comprising: determining if a program edge is hot, comprising determining if the profiling instruction is executed, and updating profiling counters associated with the profiling instruction; determining if a cold edge becomes a hot edge, comprising incrementing and decrementing trigger counters, and detecting if trigger counters overflow and underflow; preventing a false phase transition by detecting trigger counters underflow*", as recited in such manners in Claim 9, 18 and 27: The prior arts of record do not disclose the further steps as shown above.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ted T. Vo whose telephone number is (703) 308-9049. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

After October 25, 2004, examiner can be reached at new telephone number (571) 272-3706 and the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3694.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TED T. VO

TTV
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2122
September 17, 2004